Ham-Policy Digest   Thu, 23 Jun 94   Volume 94 : Issue 279

Today's Topics:
                        CW - THE GEEZER MODE!
                     Ham-Policy Digest V94 #277
                       LARC vs ARRL now moot?

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 22 Jun 94 15:42:00 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: CW - THE GEEZER MODE!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>In article <2E075522@msmail.uthscsa.edu> you wrote:
>
>: Lets see your computer pick out one signal among several hundred
>: in an RTTY or any other digital mode pileup!
>
>Um, I guess the authors of the ax.25 mode weren't smart enough to think
>of that....
>
>There aren't digital pileups for precisely the reasons you mentioned:
>Humans don't run the radio, and therefore, my computer is not tempted to
>cause malicious interferance to other stations. In fact, it is quite
>polite and always takes it's turn. Once in a great while it will
>transmit when another station does, but the frequency clears, the
>computers sort their differences out, and the information gets through.

>
>Not only that, but the computers can sort out upwards of 20 different
>conversations going on on the same frequency.
>
>All modes have their ups and downs. Quit slamming the one you don't use
>in a public forum. Notice that I sent this to you in PRIVATE mail.
>And most importantly, let others enjoy the art of making RF waves in
>whatever fashion they like... as long as they don't break the groundrules
>laid by Part 97, anyway.....
>
>I will you my 73... (rifle that is - old radiotelegraph ops quote)
>Nate Duehr
>
>--
>##
>Nathan N. Duehr - Private Pilot - Student Commercial Pilot
>Email: nduehr@netcom.com   AMPRnet: n0ntz@n0ntz.ampr.org
>CAP: Pikes Peak 120   Ham BBS: n0ntz@n0qcu.#neco.co.usa.na
>Memorable quote:"Scan 1.08 found "Windows" - Remove (y/n)?"
>##
>

Nate,
     Thanks for your considerate response. You are one of the
rare ones that does not resort to name calling when you do not
agree with an opinion, I respect that. Sure, *YOUR* computer is
only as considerate as its operator. You could still hit that
"send key" at any time. I didn't mean to slam any particular
mode. I do use RTTY, AMTOR, PACKET, etc. and as you said, each
has its place.
Straight key CW has always been one of my favorite modes. That's
not because I can't use any other modes. I have a Yaesu FT-890
with the FL-7000 amp (great rigs!) plus several others. I enjoy
the other modes and use them regularly (semi).
As I said in my original posting, CW is one of the easiest modes
to use for difficult conditions. That is why there are endorsements
for WAC, WAS, DXCC etc for SSB, RTTY....
So there....
73 Nate.

Kevin

Legal stuff:
The above opinions are my own and not necessarily those of the staff,
faculty, administration, or lab animals (woof!) of The University of
Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio.

```
      -----------------------------------------------------------------------
 Kevin R. Muenzler, WB5RUE              The University of Texas Health
 muenzlerk@uthscsa.edu                   Science Center at San Antonio,
                                        Department of Computing Resources
  ** He who tootheth not his own horn the same shall not be tooted  **
  **          There is no such thing as a Monkey-Proof Program!      **
  **                           I can prove it!                       **
      -----------------------------------------------------------------------
```

```
------------------------------
```

Date: 22 Jun 94 11:58:56 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #277
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

At the risk of taking this discussion off on another tangent, CW does
have another, not often-cited advantage -- its slow data rate...

How's that? Well, many people around the world don't speak English well,
or at all. Many of us have rudiments of a foreign language, or want to
learn. The very "slowness" of CW encourages me to try my French with F,
FG, FO hams. They, by the same token, don't have to worry about their
accent in English, and can take the time to "write" grammatically enough
to be understood. Q signals are also a help in this respect, of course.

73, Pete
N4ZR@netcom.com

```
------------------------------
```

Date: 22 Jun 1994 21:09:06 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!ceylon!
news2.near.net!info-server.bbn.com!news!levin@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: LARC vs ARRL now moot?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I was pleased to see in the July issue of QST that regardless of
whether ARRL and Lambda ARC have settled the issue of advertising, the
editorial department has no qualms about reporting LARC activities;
there is a two-page spread on the topic of DXpeditions LARC and/or its
members have participated in.

     /JBL

[P.S. Followups have been redirected. Unless you plan to discuss the

contents of the article in question, please respect this if you
        choose to follow up.]

==

Date: Wed, 22 Jun 1994 07:35:41 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!
gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2tsod8$h04@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>, <2u4k1viog1@rosebud.ncd.com>,
<CrrAGq.C9t@world.std.com>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

In article <CrrAGq.C9t@world.std.com> dts@world.std.com (Daniel T Senie) writes:
>In article <2u4k1viog1@rosebud.ncd.com> stevew@sheridan.ncd.com (Steve Wilson)
writes:
>>Reverse auto-patches are nominally considered illegal under most circumstances.
>>(This should start a nice little flame war ;-) because a non-amateur isn't
>>allowed to cause a transmitter to turn-on.(That is the normal arguement
>>anyway.) So, here is something potentially useful that IS prevented by the
>>current regulations.
>
>[much material deleted]
>
>I'll bite on this one. The repeater is under automatic control. The controller
>is able to sense conditions, and give indications. Some repeater controllers
>announce the time every so often (responded to a change in the clock, thus
>an automatic stimulus) some repeaters indicate a change in temperature at
>the repeater site. Others give an indication of intrusion alarm if someone
>enters the repeater site.
>
>What is different about the fact that the repeater notices that the phgone
>is ringing? They are ALL things that the repeater observed in its environment,
>and reported upon.

The difference is that phone patches are *third party* communications
and repeaters cannot operate under automatic control while conducting
third party communications (97.109(e)). Also 97.115(b)(1) requires the
control operator to directly supervise any third party communications.
Airing a third party by just automatically answering the phone with no
idea who is on the other end is the height of lack of supervision. It

could be a telemarketer calling every number in the exchange. That
would be illegal commercial use of amateur radio.

It might be all right if the repeater were to send telemetry saying
"the phone's ringing, and the caller ID is XXX-XXXX" and letting the
control operator then decide whether to issue commands to answer the
phone. At least that's *some* degree of supervision.

Gary
--

```
Gary Coffman KE4ZV          |    You make it,     | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems |    we break it.     | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way             |    Guaranteed!      | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244     |                     |
```

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us) wrote:

: The difference is that phone patches are *third party* communications
: and repeaters cannot operate under automatic control while conducting
: third party communications (97.109(e)). Also 97.115(b)(1) requires the
: control operator to directly supervise any third party communications.
: Airing a third party by just automatically answering the phone with no
: idea who is on the other end is the height of lack of supervision. It
: *could* be a telemarketer calling every number in the exchange. That
: would be illegal commercial use of amateur radio.

: It might be all right if the repeater were to send telemetry saying
: "the phone's ringing, and the caller ID is XXX-XXXX" and letting the
: control operator then decide whether to issue commands to answer the
: phone. At least that's *some* degree of supervision.

How about if everyone entrusted with reverse autopatch privileges were
given a unique password? They would become control ops, but that's
okay. The repeater could keep records of who was on when. You could
even have the machine announce who was engaging the reverse patch
before connecting, so everyone could verify that no password had been
compromised, or disable the ones that were right away.

```
-drt

-------------------------------------------------------------------------
|David R. Tucker    KG2S         8P9CL            drt@world.std.com|
-------------------------------------------------------------------------


------------------------------

Date: Wed, 22 Jun 1994 07:08:33 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!
gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <215.364.1442.0NA70318@megasystem.com>,
<062094101728Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <CrpwG2.Lot@news.Hawaii.Edu>¿É
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: CW - THE ONLY MODE!

In article <CrpwG2.Lot@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
writes:
>I'm curious about something that might seem completely unrelated to the
>code vs no-code debate: Most 4-year colleges/universities still require
>2 years of a foreign language. Those of you who believe that code is
>outdated and/or shouldn't be given the present weight it enjoys on
>the amateur exams, please ask yourself the following: Is this 2-year
>foreign language requirement outdated  in that there are other necessary
>skills required for students to master in order to be ready for today's
>work-force upon graduation?

Well first I'd note that Morse is not a language, so the parallel isn't
there. Now to answer the question, I'd say that yes, the requirement
is obsolete (actually always has been) for most jobs in the workforce.
Jobs that deal with import/export could benefit from knowledge of Japanese
or Spanish, but with the now near universal dominance of English as the
language of commerce, that's not a hard and fast requirement. Note that
IVECO, an international consortium with 5 different native languages,
chose to conduct all their operations in English, a language that's not
native to any of the consortium members, because English is the language
of international commerce. For most US workers, knowledge of a second
language will never be an issue in their job performance.

I'd note that this is the traditional engineering/technical school
view that's in contrast to the "liberal arts" view of the schools
of humanities and education. Those fuzzy thinkers consider knowledge
of a second language "broadening", but then so are Moon Pies if done
to excess.

Gary
```

```
--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV          |    You make it,      | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems |    we break it.      | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way             |    Guaranteed!       | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244     |                      |

-----------------------------

Date: Wed, 22 Jun 1994 21:17:55 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
uhog.mit.edu!news.mtholyoke.edu!world!dts@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2u4k1v$iog$1@rosebud.ncd.com>, <CrrAGq.C9t@world.std.com>,
<1994Jun22.073541.1103@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

In article <1994Jun22.073541.1103@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary
Coffman) writes:
>In article <CrrAGq.C9t@world.std.com> dts@world.std.com (Daniel T Senie) writes:
>>In article <2u4k1v$iog$1@rosebud.ncd.com> stevew@sheridan.ncd.com (Steve Wilson)
>>writes:
>>>Reverse auto-patches are nominally considered illegal under most circumstances.
>>>(This should start a nice little flame war ;-)  because a non-amateur isn't
>>>allowed to cause a transmitter to turn-on.(That is the normal arguement
>>>anyway.) So, here is something potentially useful that IS prevented by the
>>>current regulations.
>>
>>[ much material deleted]
>>
>>I'll bite on this one. The repeater is under automatic control. The controller
>>is able to sense conditions, and give indications. Some repeater controllers
>>announce the time every so often (responded to a change in the clock, thus
>>an automatic stimulus) some repeaters indicate a change in temperature at
>>the repeater site. Others give an indication of intrusion alarm if someone
>>enters the repeater site.
>>
>>What is different about the fact that the repeater notices that the phgone
>>is ringing? They are ALL things that the repeater observed in its environment,
>>and reported upon.
>
>The difference is that phone patches are *third party* communications
>and repeaters cannot operate under automatic control while conducting
>third party communications (97.109(e)). Also 97.115(b)(1) requires the

Sure, the PATCH is third party. But the ringing of the telephone is not.
A HAM must punch the codes that connect the controller to the phone line
```

proper.

The controller could ALSO notice, in addition to the fact that the
phone is ringing, what number originated the call, and announce
that. In that case, the ham can decide if the call should be
answered (assumes caller ID).

>control operator to directly supervise any third party communications.
>Airing a third party by just automatically answering the phone with no
>idea who is on the other end is the height of lack of supervision. It
>*could* be a telemarketer calling every number in the exchange. That
>would be illegal commercial use of amateur radio.

No. The HAM picked up the phone. The repeater and the ham in the
car are NOT in the telemarketing business. Therefore the signal
carried over RF (the part that's covered by part 97) was done
under the control of hams, not under control of the telemarketer, and
therefore there is no business use. Same thing as calling a pizza
joint.

>
>It might be all right if the repeater were to send telemetry saying
>"the phone's ringing, and the caller ID is XXX-XXXX" and letting the
>control operator then decide whether to issue commands to answer the
>phone. At least that's *some* degree of supervision.

Agreed as a better supervision, but not required...

--

Daniel Senie   Internet: dts@world.std.com
Daniel Senie Consulting   n1jeb@world.std.com
508-779-0439   Compuserve: 74176,1347

Date: Wed, 22 Jun 1994 17:51:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!
wariat.org!dreaml!jga@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <061994105340Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <2u3aea$ggf@chnews.intel.com>,
<062094095031Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>reaml
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----

dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

[bunch of stuff deleted]
>Now we can use the term 'open' correctly , to mean a carrier operated
>squelch system.

I see. Now 'open' means the machine is just carrier-operated. There is no
such thing as an 'open' machine that is in buzz-guard? (avoiding Motorola's
trademark so Karl doesn't have to reply just to explain it again) I can
think of a few. 'Open' is the policy of the trustee, not the mechanical
or electrical requirements to key the machine. If I had a machine that was
in buzz and DTMF access, but I didn't care who used it, or who had the
DTMF code, then that would be an 'Open' repeater. If you don't have buzz
in your radio, well too bad. Just because everyone and his brother CAN'T
get in to the machine doesn't mean that it is 'Closed'.

Now, I don't want any reply with the 'All repeaters are closed' arguement.
Yes. I agree. But there are such things as 'Open' repeaters, since it is
up to the trustee.

- -j

- --
Jon Anhold N8USK   - PGP Key available on request -   (jga@dreaml.wariat.org)
"Where you come from is gone.. Where you thought you were going to was never
there, and where you are ain't no good unless you can get away from it."
This .signature brought to you by the letter "Z" and the numbers "0" and "3".

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: 2.6

iQCVAgUBLgi0G4GdevUcYbJdAQHH5wP9HW7zQp2mF8EhMTH+BTYyFymM+aa+6g14
FlpmiVoJO6eq652zN9oTYF4pbePLX4AGCG+n6ISMNH5xfs2/wQQXqB9lQVBi71Ml
ITv3vvCXKdCw8YG97BmK3p9+4p5bSj9uah6QuoC0sSM7gY98HoB8J1Ib4W9C8bLz
+6FxbBbQ360=
=D+2Z
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

Date: Wed, 22 Jun 1994 23:26:57 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <062094101728Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <CrpwG2.Lot@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<1994Jun22.070833.939@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>¸Æ
Subject : Re: CW - THE ONLY MODE!

In article <1994Jun22.070833.939@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary

Coffman) writes:
>In article <CrpwG2.Lot@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
writes:
>>I'm curious about something that might seem completely unrelated to the
>>code vs no-code debate: Most 4-year colleges/universities still require
>>2 years of a foreign language. Those of you who believe that code is
>>outdated and/or shouldn't be given the present weight it enjoys on
>>the amateur exams, please ask yourself the following: Is this 2-year
>>foreign language requirement outdated in that there are other necessary
>>skills required for students to master in order to be ready for today's
>>work-force upon graduation?

>Well first I'd note that Morse is not a language, so the parallel isn't
>there.

My intent was not to call Morse code a language. It was to see if the
type of reasoning which some use to say that code is obsolete parallels
the reasoning used to say that knowledge of a foreign language is
obsolete.

I would suspect that those who say Morse isn't an efficient use
of time would similarly state that learning a foreign is not an
efficient use of time during the undergrad years. Of course, I
believe BOTH are an efficient use of one's time. I don't believe
that streamlining the undergrad curriculum to just one's major
is beneficial to the student or to society.

As a Ph.D. student I have to demonstrate proficiency in three
scientic languages, for in the course of research one cannot
expect all research journals to be translated into English.

>Now to answer the question, I'd say that yes, the requirement
>is obsolete (actually always has been) for most jobs in the workforce.

At least my hypothesis was correct in regards to you, for we also
know your stance towards code.

Jeff NH6IL

Date: 23 Jun 94 04:06:23 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!ulowell!
woods.uml.edu!martinja@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <062094101728Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <CrpwG2.Lot@news.Hawaii.Edu>,

<1994Jun22.070833.939@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: CW - THE ONLY MODE!

In article <1994Jun22.070833.939@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us
(Gary Coffman) writes:
> In article <CrpwG2.Lot@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu
(Jeffrey Herman) wrote:
>>I'm curious about something that might seem completely unrelated to the
>>code vs no-code debate: Most 4-year colleges/universities still require
>>2 years of a foreign language. Those of you who believe that code is
>>outdated and/or shouldn't be given the present weight it enjoys on
>>the amateur exams, please ask yourself the following: Is this 2-year
>>foreign language requirement outdated in that there are other necessary
>>skills required for students to master in order to be ready for today's
>>work-force upon graduation?

> Well first I'd note that Morse is not a language,

Bzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzt!!!

Then what the hell is it? Boy! We are really digging deep for the crap now!

My pocket dictionary has as one of its definitions for "language" as follows:

    A system of signs, symbols, etc. used for communications.

This along with every other definition for language colors you somewhat
incorrect. Some of defenses I'm seeing against the code are living proof
that the "dummy down" theory is alive and well in amateur radio.

Another thing, cw is NOT an obsolete mode. It is one of many modes available
to those who have learned it and like to use it. I think many folks have
things confused here. Doesn't "obsolete" mean no longer in use? Or variations
of that definition? I tune across the HF spectrum daily and hear plenty of
cw all over the place. Outside as well as inside the amateur bands. I think
what you and others are really trying to say is that you don't believe it
should be used as a ticket to obtain HF privileges. Heck, as it is the
no-code techs have more privileges above 50 MHz than anyone else has below.
Of course except for Novices, everyone else has the privileges above too.

Just because there is a growing number of folks wanting either the code speed
requirement slowed or the eradication of code, it doesn't mean it's
going to happen. It certainly does not mean that code is obsolete. IMHO
whether it is obsolete or whether it should not be used as a requirement to
gain HF privileges we should realize that the two have nothing to do with
each other and that the main argument is not whether code is obsolete
but as I said above, whether it should be used as a requirement to obtain
HF operating privileges.

I'm seeing a lot of people coming in here and posting just for the sake of
argument. Fine. But be realistic. I do see a day in the future where the
requirements are going to be much different than we see them now. And as
the number of non-code folks increases so will the political clout of that
particular faction and they will eventually get what they want. But, I also
see them eventually losing all that they got. Because down the road there will
be a newer faction wanting something and these same non-code folks will be
screaming and trying to preserve what they have. Eventually, someone in a
high political office is going to say enough is enough.

Even though technology will make more efficient use of the frequency spectrum,
that still won't be enough to quench the thirst of the spectrum hungry
commercial interests. They got bucks. And bucks talk. You cannot deny that.
That is what will eventually get you what you want now. The radio folks
are chomping at the bit to get you those HF privileges so they can sell you
those shiny new rigs. And then, when you abuse the heck outta what you got...
BOOM! Anyone caught operating those shiny new rigs on those frequencies
that USED to belong to the Amateur Radio Service will be attacked by the
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Rigs, and Firearms. You know, the BATRF.
You really think that we will receive congressional protection of the
frequencies we have now? Heck, they can't even protect the Constitution of
this country. You watch! Things will get twisted and turned and loopholes
will erode it all away. No? You say no? Oh you are so blind as to what is
really going on in this world.

Be thankful for what you have now. Be patient for the changes that will be
made in your favor. Finally, be thankful for what you had when they take it
away from you. Sounds prophetic doesn't it?

It's meant to be....sort of.

JJm   \/\/K1\/

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #279
****